Info-ParaNet Newsletters Volume I Number 500

Monday, November 18th 1991

Today's Topics:

Ogden Gifs
Angel
Strieber
Implants
Geographic Mag.
Re: Revelations
Strieber
unidentified organism
Re: "REVELATIONS"
Hyser report
Re: The End of Freedom
Hyser Report
"Revelations"
(none)

From: Mike.Keithly@p0.f605.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Mike Keithly)
Subject: Ogden Gifs
Date: 9 Nov 91 04:24:01 GMT

>> I have the Ogden gifs here for D\loading if anyone wants them.

> Are they available by freq?

Poll me here and I will set them aside, remember they are the sketches not the laser photos. Peggy Noonan will have those I hope soon..
Mike Keithly

> ---
> * Origin: UFINET//PARANET//MUFONET//ODYSSEY (407)649-4136
> (1:363/29)

--
Mike Keithly - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Mike.Keithly@p0.f605.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Keith.Basterfield@f12.n1040.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Keith Basterfield)
Subject: Angel
Date: 7 Nov 91 23:08:00 GMT

Thanks for checking for that reference for me. Much appreciated.

--
Keith Basterfield - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Keith.Basterfield@f12.n1040.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Keith.Basterfield@f12.n1040.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Keith Basterfield)
Subject: Strieber
Date: 7 Nov 91 23:12:00 GMT

Hi Sheldon, Thanks for that copy of the Communion Letter with Strieber's farewell speech. In the text he seems to be looking at the concept of the "imaginal world", i.e. a location which can at times be physical and at other times 'mental.' I hear US psychologist Kenneth Ring is working on a book about abductions, with this "imaginal world" in mind as the explanation. Ring was formely deep into research on Near Death Experiences. Thanks again for the copy.

--
Keith Basterfield - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Keith.Basterfield@f12.n1040.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Keith.Sonerson.UFORA.Associate.VIC@f15.n1040.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Keith Sonerson UFORA Associate VIC
)
Subject: Implants
Date: 1 Nov 91 06:39:00 GMT

Hello Peggy...

> >Peggy, in a message on 12th Oct you mentioned a radio
> show>which included a man who talked about a personal
> abduction and
> >implant.
> >Do you by chance have any further details on him?

> name: Richard Price
> He says he was implanted by aliens and that

> the implant or probe has been removed and is in the
> hands of scientists at MIT and they're baffled about
> what it is. "They don't what type of device it
> is...they only thing they've come up with is a
> chemical analysis. I just got the report...We're not
> sure if it's a device of some kind -- it's a chemical
> of some kind. The scientist does not know what it is.
> He didn't exactly come out and say that it is a
> material that isn't made here on this earth."
>   He had it in his body for 35 years and knew it
> was there. When asked why he waited so long to find
> out about it, he said "that's when it decided to come
> out" and it came out about 2 years ago. He was
> implanted at age 8.
>   ---That's from the opening of the interview.
>   I will get more to you when I can. Does this
> help? Perhaps you know this person or his story? He
> says he's told the story a number of times.
>
> ==Peggy==

This case sounds very interesting.

If at all possible, I would like to obtain a copy of your
audio tape. I would send you the postage and cost prior to
you sending it to me,

Can you provide any more insight as to the physical and
structural characteristics?

Regards,

Keith Sonerson

--
Keith Sonerson UFORA Associate VIC - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Keith.Sonerson.UFORA.Associate.VIC@f15.n1040.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Vladimir.Godic@f7.n1040.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Vladimir Godic)
Subject: Geographic Mag.
Date: 9 Nov 91 06:16:00 GMT

> Th Nat'l Geographic issue June 1983 has a great feature story
> onTHE UNIVERSE. Although that quote I was looking for on
> Jupiter did not appear in this issue (the way I remembered),
> it's possible the quote was in another issue. I'm still
> checking.

Hi Linda,
Many thanks for that.

 > However, there was a reference to Jupiter being a "brown dwarf."
 > It reads:
 >   Jupiter is such an object (a brown dwarf), too small to
 > "turn on" by nuclear fusion but still shedding heat from its
 > collapse. Brown dwarfs cannot be seen at great distances but
 > may well account for a large part of a galaxy's mass.

I remember reading about Jupiter being "a brown dwarf" and too
small to turn into a star. Anyway by the time I come back 'on the air"
you'll probably have more info. See you in two weeks time.
Regards,
Vlad
 > I hope I gave you something of use. If I am misinformed, I know
 > someone like (Clark Matthews) will rescue me. <:-)
 >
 > Regards,
 >
 > Linda
 >
 > June '83 Nat'l Geographic, p. 717

--
Vladimir Godic - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Vladimir.Godic@f7.n1040.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Michael.Schuyler@f201.n350.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Schuyler)
Subject: Re: Revelations
Date: 9 Nov 91 18:25:00 GMT

In a message to All <10-31-91 21:34> Michael Corbin wrote:

MC> On Sunday, October 27th, I had the great pleasure to meet with
MC> Jacques Vallee while he was here in Denver. He has recently
MC> published a new book titled "Revelations." I have read the book and
MC> will be doing a book review of it very soon, but I did want to post
MC> something about Vallee's outstanding work. The book deals with the
MC> aspect of ufology that most of us will not accept: disinformation
MC> and who is behind it. I am sure that most of the ufo community will
MC> find the book caustic, however it is a very refreshing look at just
MC> how badly the research community has faltered in their efforts to
MC> bring an understanding of the UFO phenomena. Get the book and read
MC> it.

I would like to second this opinion. This new book is clearly one of th

most lucid treatments of the contemporary scene in existence. Vallee also brings an international flavor to the UFO problem that I think we often miss by concentrating on North American happenings. Well worthwhile. Buy it in hardback!
--Michael S.

--
Michael Schuyler - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Schuyler@f201.n350.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Sheldon.Wernikoff@p0.f605.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Sheldon Wernikoff)
Subject: Strieber
Date: 11 Nov 91 03:38:01 GMT

Hello Keith, glad to hear you received the Strieber letter. I agree with you that he seems to be emphasizing the "imaginal world" as the region of mind where the "visitors" reside.

Strieber states that the key to whom they [visitors] choose, is that they "choose the ones who have run out of alternatives, who have no inner circle left but to trust the dark. When a person who yearns inwardly for change reaches the psychological breaking point, the visitors may come in through the cracks in that person's wall of belief. There are things at large in the night of the soul; the visitors live there." If that's true, I can certainly see why they chose him...since he's way beyond the breaking point.

The letter is filled with contradictions of his earlier statements, but is written with a style that should continue to captivate his converts, of which there are many. I used to be a member of a "Communion" group here in Chicago, but was expelled by the group facilitator for being "too scientific", and not in need of support. The small group continues, without support from Whitley, and from what I hear from a friend that still attends the meetings, has deteriorated into nothing more than a social club of questionable value.

I too look forward to Kenneth Ring's book on abductions along with David Jacobs' work which is due out in March. They should both make interesting reading.

Take care,

Sheldon

--

Sheldon Wernikoff - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Sheldon.Wernikoff@p0.f605.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: cbmvax.cbm.commodore.com!vanth!jms
Subject: unidentified organism
Date: 11 Nov 91 06:33:32 GMT

From: vanth!jms@cbmvax.cbm.commodore.com (Jim Shaffer)

I saw this on ABC a while ago and I was waiting to see if anyone else on the net was going to mention it, but aside from someone on Usenet (who had the location wrong) I haven't heard anything. I figure I can't let it get any older.

The story (reported, I think, on November 1) is as follows:

About 'a month ago', the police in St. Louis, Missouri, found a box alongside the road 'near Highway 100 and Deer Creek Road in West County'. Inside the box was a glass jar full of vinegar, and in the vinegar was the 'blob'. It consists of four parts, of which one is a tentacle. It has no bones or hair. The police say that Woods Hole marine biology lab, in Massachusetts, told them they thought it was a land animal rather than a marine animal. (The reason for this wasn't mentioned.) A veterinarian at the St. Louis zoo couldn't identify it. It allegedly has no identifiable cartilage, tendons, nerves, or blood vessels. Aside from the tentacle, it appears to be an elastic brown/grey ball, divided into two hemispheres joined at the bottom. (I don't know if it was found that way or if they cut it open.) It has cavities inside the hemispheres. I couldn't see any other features in the hemispheres; the texture appeared smooth and if I remember rightly it was fairly homogenous. I really can't describe the tentacle or the other part.

I found it interesting that absolutely no-one in the report, from the police officer to the veterinarian to the reporter, was identified either verbally or by caption.

Is anyone close enough to St. Louis to look into this? As of the time of the report, the police still had the body. The reporter was stupid enough to mention where they were keeping it, as a matter of fact.

--
 * From the disk of: | jms@vanth.uucp | I'm in a groove now
 Jim Shaffer, Jr. | uunet!cbmvax!vanth!jms | -- or is it a rut?
 37 Brook Street | jms%vanth@cbmvax.commodore.com |
 Montgomery, PA 17752 | 72750.2335@compuserve.com | (Rush, 'Face Up')

From: Kay.Mclaughlin@p0.f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Kay Mclaughlin)
Subject: Re: "REVELATIONS"
Date: 6 Nov 91 06:29:00 GMT

DE> Ballantine Books and read a great deal of it this weekend. Yes, in my
DE> opinion Vallee will once more stand the UFO field on its collective
DE> head.

DE> No, I would guess that many people in the UFO field will not take
DE> kindly to Vallee's assessment of the flying disks and the people that
DE> chase them. What will be interesting however, is to see how long it
DE> takes before many people are screaming that "Vallee must be a
DE> government plant". That seems to be the fate of anyone who breaks from
DE> the fold. I still think that he is one hell of a researcher, and I do
DE> NOT agree with all his conclusions, but I DO think they are necessary.
                                                ^ ^^ ^^^^^ ^^^^ ^^^ ^^^^^^^

As far as the "screaming" it has already begun. After spending nearly two weeks on a business trip, my generous employer gave me a day off. I was flipping around and saw Vallee on "Sonya Live" on CNN. I missed the first 3 mins. but taped the rest. He was promoting the new book, and took audience calls

A caller came in from New jersey (ellen chrystal) has a book coming out next march saying that Valee was accused in a Paris Match article as being part of the disinformation campaign.

To which he replied:
Everybody has been accusing everybody else, there is obviously a party line here and that party line is that we are being visited by extraterrestrials. All I can tell you is that as scientist I can not jump to that conclusion yet it is one of the hypotheses,
there are many other possibilities.

When Sonya asked about abductions, he replied:

The burden is on the scientists to examine the physical data and the physiological data. At the same time my concern with the methods that have been used to study abduction cases is that in most cases hypnosis has been used in a way that I think is totally irresponsible and in a way that would not be accepted by the scientific community. The standards have been very loose, in some cases ideas have been planted in the minds of the witnesses.

Regards,
Kay

--
Kay Mclaughlin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Kay.Mclaughlin@p0.f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Hyser report
Date: 10 Nov 91 09:12:00 GMT

Here's the scoop on the Hyser report (so far).

Rex Salisberry says he has a copy of William Hyser's report on some of Ed Walter's photos but can't release it to us yet because of a committment he made to Hyser to not release the report without his (Hyser) permission.

Jerry Black sent a copy to Phil Klass, and Phil quoted a little of it in his newsletter. Rex said Hyser went through the roof.

Anyway, the gist of the report is that Hyser found quite a few things in the photos that were *consistent with* multiple exposures, but nothing that constituted *proof* of multiple exposures.

I think we've already discussed most of those items and picked the photos apart, but of course we don't have any clout so we don't really count. ;-)

Also, in the October 1991 _Photomethods_, (a journal for commercial/ industrial photographers) Hyser went through an example of how to do a multiple exposure and have the object appear to be behind another darker object. The example was a ufo behind a church steeple at night (surprise!)

Anyway, he presents the idea of the film's threshold sensitivity as being the key to having a foreground object appear black against a slightly light object.

Look at Ed Walter's photo #1, in which we see a ufo behind a tree branch. Keep that in mind.

Now I'll walk through the threshold sensitivity thing, in plain English. In the graphic arts and photolab industries, the process is called flashing, so you guys familiar with that stuff will now already know what I'm talking about.

Photographic film (paper etc.) requires a minimum amount of light for an image to "stick." For example, let's say the threshold is five photon (units of light). If the film receives only four photons, they'll most likely dissipate before you develop the film. If the film receives more than five photons, they "stick" and you have a latent image (waiting to be developed).

So, an area of film that receives only four photons will be black (clear) and an area that receives six photons will have density.

Listen closely now.....

A ufo model is first photographed against a black background, and is exposed just below the threshold, say, just under five photons. If you were to develop the film, you'd see no image.

But you make a second exposure on the same sheet of film. The second exposure consists of a black tree and an illuminated skyline. You make this exposure slightly underexposed.

Where the tree overlaps the ufo, the film doesn't receive any additional light, so you have a total exposure still of just under five photons; no image.

The combination of the skyline *and* the ufo below-the-threshold image make up more than five photons, so not only do you have the skyline image, you've kicked the ufo image over the five-photon threshold too; you have an image of a ufo against a skyline, with a (black) tree that appears to be in front of the ufo.

But such a multiple exposure isn't without artifacts. The very dark image of the ufo will tend to take on the colors of the background. Sort of a chameleon effect.

Also, to heighten the contrast between the ufo image and the skyline, you can develop the film for a longer time (Polaroid 108 too).

Now, take another good close look at the Ed Walters photos......

My opinion? (since you didn't ask)

This process is certainly workable, and wouldn't be anywhere near as cumbersome as masking techniques in the darkroom, then printing onto Polaroid etc. But it'd be hard to control. But certainly workable.

I think we have another valid hoax theory. Not proof, but a theory that can explain photo #1.

William G. Hyser is a consultant in optical instrumentation, photogrammetry, forensic engineering, electrical contact physics and illumination engineering. Perhaps best of all, he's not a ufologist.

jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Steve.Rose@p0.f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Steve Rose)
Subject: Re: The End of Freedom
Date: 9 Nov 91 23:13:00 GMT

CM> Hello, Steve. Every scenario is a "live at the top" scenario,
CM> wouldn't you agree? It helps to be on the winning side, of
CM> course -- the people at the top of history's dustbin experience
CM> lots of problems as a rule.

Those at the bottom experience a lot more. Nature of things and all...

CM> BTW, sounds like you speak from personal experience about how
CM> unaccountable NatSec funds never get to the lowly technical levels

Let's not get into specific areas...but do you think that mob (sic) is the only organization that knows how to get their laundry so clean?

> The old addage, "_____ are people, too" seems to fit.

CM> Gee, somehow this fails to reassure me, Steve. I personally wish

CM> that the "local grunts" would get real jobs.

To them...that IS their job! Who should assure them that they would can no future in it and should go out in this recession-riddled world to find other work!? To some of them...it is 'cushy'...to others, a daily struggle. The electronic side may be fun and mysterious to you...but is it all wires...bolts...and 9-volt Radio Shack batteries in the bee-hive.

CM> Okay, okay, call me a bad-tempered bastard who refuses to
CM> acknowledge the humanity of the people who tap my phones, snoop
CM> on these message echos (as human BBS callers and thru anonymous UNIX
CM> FTPs) and who may someday come knocking on my door at 5 a.m.

Much like the police...private gum-shoes...and insurance fraud hounds...or are they, too, in a dead end non-respective line of work? And why should anyone come 'knocking at 5:00am?' 10:00am is a more respectable hour! Perhaps you should re-print your party invitations. ;-)

CM> I think that people in these organizations will find, provoke, or
CM> fabricate reasons to preserve themselves and their power. Since
CM> I don't work for them, this possibility does bother me.

On the contrary...you seem QUITE bothered by them. All they do is punch their clock as anyone else would. They are not monsters (at least not after their second cup of coffee). They do not 'relish' their authority unless they have this insatiable appetite for paperwork. And they are certainly NOT after you unless you are a known menace to society. As of 11-09-91...you are not.

Yes...I know this sounds all goody-two shoes and winning-team and such...but to paint this ominous picture of big-brotherism, is about as believable and laughable as the supermarket tabloid corps.
Sorry, but there's no K.I.T.T. mobile in any Knight Foundation, either.

CM> an extraordinary number of people are worried and disillusioned
CM> about the alaming stories of gov't covert operations, domestic
CM> operations, secret funding, murdered reporters, and all the rest.

Oh pleeeease. What is so 'secret' about these publically KNOWN groups? They may not tell YOU all that they do...but they exist and the public knows of them and their stated purpose. Next, you'll be saying how 'Greys' really run the country and that WAS a Grey photographed arm in arm with Bush...who must also be a Grey in disguise. Oppps...forget that. Someone in another group already beat you to it. ;-)

CM> There's also palpable public disgust and dismay that the entire
CM> political/government/extragovermental system is out of reach,
CM> above change, and only serves itself.

And the sun rises in the east. Big deal.
Mixing bits of unrelated truism in any claims does not validate its reality.

> Quite an imagination! As they say nowadays..."Sell it to
> Hollywood."

 >
 CM> Well, maybe 48 Hours? Or EG&G?

Somehow, I believe they are not willing to smear whatever above-board
reputation they may be enjoying...even during a sweeps month. :-)

 > Just put in your 80+ years and check out like a true
 > champ. We're not going anywhere, either.   ;-)
 CM>
 CM> Who's "We"? You and your tapeworm?

Me and the six billion plus people on the globe's surface and their pet
platypuses. Although the platypus will probably outlive most of us.

--
Steve Rose - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Steve.Rose@p0.f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Michael.Corbin@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: Hyser Report
Date: 11 Nov 91 12:49:00 GMT

Thanks for your work and presentation of this to ParaNet.

Mike

--
Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@p0.f428.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Burke@f9.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (John Burke)
Subject: "Revelations"
Date: 12 Nov 91 07:55:00 GMT

Don Ecker writes:

 > No, I would guess that many people in the UFO field will
 > not take kindly to Vallee's assessment of the flying disks

> and the people that chase them. What will be interesting
> however, is to see how long it takes before many people are
> screaming that "Vallee must be a government plant". That
> seems to be the fate of anyone who breaks from the fold. I
> still think that he is one hell of a researcher, and I do
> NOT agree with all his conclusions, but I DO think they are
> necessary.

I agree. I haven't read _Revelations_ yet, but I got a real kick out of Jerry Clark's critique of it. I had read _Confrontations_ before reading Clark's critique of that work and I felt that Jerry had pinpointed all of Vallee's shortcomings and put them right under the microscope.

Although Vallee provides us with a unique and essential perspective on ufology, I think that Jerry Clark "has his number". -- In other words, in spite of the pedestal on which Vallee stands, he's just another human being like the rest of us, subject to the same flaws and capable of the same mistakes -- even those about which he writes.

-- John

--
John Burke - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Burke@f9.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: wam.umd.edu!infinity
Subject: (none)
Date: 13 Nov 91 00:33:12 GMT

From: David Elmore Coleman <infinity@wam.umd.edu>

Egyptologist Fright/Euphoria

In a September/October USA Today article in the Arts or Leisure or you-know-that-section, the findings of a Boston University Geologist concerning the Sphinx are discussed. The scientist, I do not have the article with me but I will follow this up, confirmed the suspicions of an independent, maverick archaeologist who he had, needless to say, not respected. The Sphinx is 'at least 8 to 10 thousands years old' according to the article in USA Today, and according to the detailed erosion patterns of the base of the Sphinx. On October 23rd, some national association of geologists met in San Diego to hear the findings. I am hoping to find the address of this national organization so that I may receive a copy of the proceedings. I believe the geologist has an article of his own coming, but I cannot remember.

Perhaps the Sphinx does indeed harken back to the Age of Leo,

which was between about 12,500 and 10,350 years ago. Those 'Ages' are a connection between man and the heavens, so the Sphinx was made part Man and part Lion (are there any other aspects? they might also be symbolic.) Mystics will be happy that they have another piece of evidence supporting their views of Egypt's past. (There are certain stellae that support a similar deep age for the Great Pyramid at Giza, but archaeologists hate these stellae simply out of what they purport.) The measurement of the cycle of precession of the 'Ages' is to five digits accuracy some measurement of cross diagonals in the Great Pyramid. Don't make the WIDESPREAD skeptic mistake of assuming the 'standard ruler' was guessed: the so-called pyramidal cubit is evident in the many of the measurements of the pyramid being integer multiples of it. Also don't make the ill-educated mistake of thinking that the Zodiac is based simply on constellations and because of precession of the Earth the Zodiac becomes meaningless. Rather, the Zodiac was *based solely on precession*, and was divided into twelve sections because of consideration of energy geometry (such as the octapole and hexadecapole probability distributions surrounding a hydrogen atom -- just 12 instead of 8 or 16.) This meant the ecliptic was effectively divided in twelve, and what better way to mark this for the populace than picking the twelve most significant-looking groupings of stars in the sky that would mark the times in between the twelve smooth transitions, transitions like the Dawning of Aquarius. As anti-astrologers point out, and as different cultural astronomies around the world attest, a group of stars is almost as bad as a Rorschach test, so that a happy medium could presumably have been reached between the supposed meaning (or vibrational rate) of one of the twelve Eras and what the constellation actually looks like on the sky. Or, perhaps, some of existing descriptions of contellations metamorphosed slowly to ones the priests considered more representative of the Eras they were supposed to symbolize.

By the way, does anybody know if an extra-old Sphinx throws a wrench into Z. Sitchin's Velikovshiish-Danikenish theories by wrenching his timetable of suppositions? (Good! good!)

Beyond the Ages, any significance in astrology becomes obscured. Does anyone know if the Period of the precession is related to the orbital periods and masses of the other planets? Bode's Law also remains a mystery that could be at the same level where astrology may come from. Bode's Law a mascroscopic law, such as that which causes mud to crack in hexagonal patterns (in other words, this kind of law gets 'disturbed' by other like laws that muddy it (ugh, pun.)) Bode's Law concerns the apparent attempt for the planets to follow a pattern of spacing. It seems to have to do with why asteroids form a somewhat concise belt between Jupiter and Mars.

I presume that through the importance of form, meaning, order and synchronicity between events, which is stressed in the New Physics of David Bohm, F. David Peat, etc one could explain how on some level of energy structure in the solar system, planets have more than their extremely weak gravitational influence upon one another. Actually, with Bode's Law, a gravity instability or radial anisotropy of mass in the forming solar system, possibly caused by the arrangements of stars passing by during the formative era, could cause the regular ultimate set up of planets to form in ways slightly out of whack with the way Bode's Law would appear under ideal conditions. So, the Asteroid Planet

never accumulates enough mass to cause it to develop into a single object instead of a parade of stones. Next door, an enormous Jupiter uses the mass anisotropy to unbalance its forces so that it has a net greater attraction for the formative material that is in Asteroid Territory. So, Jupiter robs the asteroids and perhaps Mars as well. Passing stars may have somehow stolen energy from Neptune, causing it to be closer to Uranus in its final orbit, and possibly larger than it otherwise would have been, as nonsmooth activity, like that of the passing star, in gas dynamics tends to cause a less smooth mass distribution, allowing Neptune to perhaps gain mass at a crest (not a well) of the distribution. Now when I mention higher levels of 'energy structure' as means by which astrology and Bode's Law might operate, I don't mean presently known energy structure. I mean an expanded idea of energy such that known forms are simply part of a smooth (or quantized!) spectrum. The idea is almost like when we had kinetic energy, but had to expand the whole *concept* of energy by deciding to expand to include Potential Energy. As many of you probably know, powerful new physics is most often created by simply expressing existing laws as first derivatives of higher laws (mathematical term here, not the simple English word 'derivative'.) One example is saying, F=dP/dt. (There is a way different from derivatives also: E=(1/2)mv^2 is complete, but there became also a more elaborate E=((P*c)^2 + ((1/2?)m*c*c)^2)^0.5.) Below is an example, which would require us to redefine how we express units! It is only an example of how much room there is, and of how confined one can feel by the lunacy of Hawking & Co. believing they can express everything as singularities et al. This formula is not meant to be correct, and it means that for n where *traditional* units *appear* not to be satisfied, the energy is not a *traditional* form of energy. As an analogue, calling expressions of the below at two different n as Energy, is just like calling velocity, acceleration and jerk three different kinds of 'motex.' One could hypothetically consider "motex" a fundamental 'quantity' I suppose.

n=dimension I'm trying to reconstruct this from memory, so

$$\text{Energy} = E_O \times \frac{d^n}{dt^n} \times \text{Space}^n$$

I think I may actually have this wrong.

OK, now for some UFOlogy in this posting, would anybody care to work out something with me so that they can send me the articles on the Mund(r)abilla case (Australia) either from MUFON (supposedly in #239 and/or #241) or UFO Research Australia? I particularly wish to have a referencible source on the study of velocity characteristics of the ash-like substance, done at Monash University. This would help me with my coverage of UFOs in Chapter 4 of my book. Once I get a preliminary copyright in advance of getting a publisher, I will try to post excerpts on Paranet in order to see how, in particular, the skeptic mindset, which is a difficult perspective for me to see from, will deal with some of my new ideas.

This is especially so that I do not phrase my ideas in ways which cause misunderstanding, or which allow a skeptic the usual trick of misinterpreting just exactly what a piece of evidence is being used to show. Here I recall Dr. Bruce Maccabee's pains to keep the importance of the Gulf Breeze photographs in its proper role in the case (notable is his reply to the Salisberry's

analysis.) Another example of this misunderstanding would be a skeptic replying to the above commentary on the Sphinx and the Ages by summarily stating, 'The idea of the Sphinx representing Man/Leo is preposterous because it is all based on simply *strands* of evidence and reference to other things that are not proven.' This person has completely missed the point of the material. Ideas such as those of mysticism are not to be viewed simply as wild-eyed claims that are wrong until proven right. They are simply 'knowledges you intuit are correct' that *wait* for science to catch up. Often the line of defence by mystics is against attempts by skeptics to show inconsistency *within mystic or ufological* doctrines. Or, it is to defend against attempts by skeptics to show part of science actually eliminates the possibility of an alleged phenomenon. When this defense appears to the mystic (sorry, I am including ufologists in this label) that it is successfully made (the words make sense,) the skeptic then says, 'but you have proved nothing; you have no physical evidence.' The mystic then gets a confused pit-of-stomach feeling they don't understand. What the mystic is missing is the recognition that the skeptic's statement is effectively an attempt to change the history of the argument. The skeptic is almost ludicrously implying, sort of unintentionally, that to defend against skeptic's point A that says some part of science kills the alleged phenomenon, the proponent must do more than show that science does *not* necessarily kill the alleged phenomenon (and the proponent did this when he/she 'successfully made' a defence -- see that quote if you wish.) The proponent must go beyond the successful defense and actually prove with physical evidence that the phenomenon definitely exists. This is a misunderstanding I see all too often and have only recently been able to catch people doing *before* re-musing the topic a day later to figure out what exactly the argument was. Every time science looks like it is about to catch up with a kernel of truth, like let us say with the crop circles, science scatters off on a tangent, like wind vortices, although it does so at a point closer to the atom of truth than it did before. Once the errant avenue (usually errant by an attempt to stay reductionist) the next approach will come at least as close to the atom of truth before scattering far off.

David E. Coleman
Graduating Senior
of Astronomy
University of Maryland

Gee, I guess it has been over since months since I put up an article!

********To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to********
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP {ncar,isis,csn}!scicom!infopara
DOMAIN infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com

For administrative requests (subscriptions, back issues) send to:

UUCP {ncar,isis,csn}!scicom!infopara-request

DOMAIN   infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com
 To obtain back issues by anonymous ftp, connect to:

DOMAIN   ftp.uiowa.edu (directory /archives/paranet)

Mail to private Paranet/Fidonet addresses from the newsletters:
DOMAIN firstname.lastname@paranet.org
UUCP scicom!paranet.org!firstname.lastname

**********The**End**of**Info-ParaNet**Newsletter**********